

sure there is not one who would hesitate for an instant to clean her patient's room, not only one day but every day, if necessary.

I am now in a home where there are four cases of typhoid. There are three nurses here, but we do not clean the rooms because the people have five servants and do not want us to do so. Of course in this instance it is not necessary, but in a very great number of homes to which I am called, I do clean my room.

I was in a home last year where the mother was quite ill, and beside caring for her constantly, I dressed three little girls for school, bathing them, combing their hair and making the necessary toilet each morning; ordered the groceries and managed the house in general, there being only one servant (she was new), so there was no one else to do these little things.

I think that we as nurses try to conform to whatever conditions we meet, and as far as possible adapt ourselves to the needs of the homes in which we daily find ourselves. I believe I voice the sentiment of the nurses of "Sunny Tennessee." I would like to have the opinion of others on this question, especially from some of the New York nurses, since the article to which I refer was suggested by a woman who "conducts one of the high-class employment bureaus of West Side, New York," so the paper states.

If this really is true, is it any wonder some of the doctors do not appreciate and patronize "graduates" more fully and exclusively?

M. E.

---

#### THE SUFFRAGE QUESTION

DEAR EDITOR: Since the historic meeting in September, 1896, in the Manhattan Beach Hotel when you and a little group of women, who were very loyal to their profession and the cause of women generally, met, to bring the Nurses' Associated Alumnae into being, I have never been disappointed in the actions of that body, of which you and I are charter members, until this year, when I read, with humiliation, I must frankly say, that a negative vote "by a large majority" was recorded at San Francisco against the reasonable and temperately expressed suffrage resolution offered to it!

It was a shock, because, though I know many nurses have never given the subject a thought, yet I believed that they might always be depended upon, in their associations, to take instinctively the intelligent and above all the sympathetic position on large human questions. I am far from thinking that nurses have time or strength for work outside of their own field, and do not expect to see them actively engaged in

the equality movement, but to give moral support and endorsement takes no time; to feel intelligent sympathy costs no money.

There are no reasons against political equality for women except selfish ones, and every good reason for it. May I run over a few of them? First, the patriotic reason: to deny the sacred duty of citizenship is to deny the foundation principle on which our democracy is built. As for the practical common sense reasons, they are on every hand. To help bring about more just and equal opportunities and equal pay for self-supporting women; to aid in the great child-saving crusade against the horrors of child labor; to carry good home-making and sanitary housekeeping into our city governments,—why I could not count all the reasons, but let me come down to concrete instances. A couple of years ago the Associated Alumnae passed a resolution endorsing the Pure Food Law. That was quite right, but now they reject a woman-suffrage resolution, although, if the housekeepers of the nation had had votes, we could have had a Pure Food Law twenty years ago.

Next, our state societies have all responded warmly to Mrs. Crane's almshouse propaganda. Again good, but look here! what's the matter with our almshouses? Men's control everywhere and no women with any authority to see that they are managed humanely. If women had votes, even municipal ones, as they have in England, we might get women on as overseers of the poor, where they ought to be. I have just had very interesting light on a large almshouse, where an excellent woman is matron. She has no authority at all, and told a lady of my acquaintance that she and the physician appealed over and over again to the county supervisors for *necessary* comforts and improvements for the poor and the sick, "but," she says, "they are not interested; they do not care, and they do not listen." How foolish for us to take up an almshouse propaganda and yet reject the belief that women should vote!

Again, our nurses are becoming keenly interested in the tuberculosis propaganda, and this is well and right. But of all things in the world the tuberculosis question is a social question and the causes of tuberculosis (outside of the bacillus) are social causes which need the ballot for their changing, such as bad housing, overwork, underpay, neglect of childhood, etc. Take the present question of the underfed school children in New York. How many of them will have tuberculosis? If mothers and nurses had votes there might be school lunches for all those children and, as often suggested, teaching could accompany the cooking and serving.

I hope that at a future meeting our members will reconsider their hasty snapshot verdict.

L. L. Dock.